



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,738	12/21/2001	Jeffrey B. Norton	16159.039001; P7221	3707
32615	7590	10/04/2004	EXAMINER	
OSHA & MAY L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			NAHAR, QAMRUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/036,738	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NORTON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Qamrun Nahar	<b>Art Unit</b> 2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 have been examined.

#### *Specification*

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "Field of Invention" section is missing on page 1 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 11 and 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Song (U.S. 5,949,999).

#### **Per Claim 1:**

The Song patent discloses:

- **a method for generating a software development tool** ("The present invention is a mechanism that integrates software engineering and system components to guide the browsing/tracking of software development documents (e.g., requirement, design, testing, etc.) and their relationships." in column 1, lines 38-42)

- **creating a definition file defining an action to be performed by the software development tool** (“The system contains a procedure definition which defines the software development procedure.” in column 1, lines 47-48)
- **creating a schema defining characteristics of a plurality of desired inputs for the software development tool** (“An interface allows users to select phase, activity, and system components and execute other utility programs or choose options.” in column 1, lines 48-50)
- **creating a resource file comprising information required by the software development tool at runtime; and generating the software development tool using the definition file, the schema, and the resource file** (“A browser interpreter interprets the selection and decides how to form and execute each command. ... A project file contains the information about system components, physical locations of the system documents, documentation tools associated with documents, options selected, hyper-links to the documents, etc” in column 1, lines 50-52 and lines 55-59).

**Per Claim 2:**

The Song patent discloses:

- **further comprising: creating a command list comprising a set of commands that are used to define the action** (column 1, lines 52-55).

**Per Claim 3:**

The Song patent discloses:

- **further comprising: generating an annotation defining custom characteristics of a user interface of the software development tool using the schema (column 4, lines 5-13 and lines 28-35).**

**Per Claim 4:**

The Song patent discloses:

- **further comprising: creating an annotation defining semantics of a graphical user interface of the software development tool, wherein the annotation is used with the definition file, the schema, and the resource file to generate the software development tool (column 4, lines 5-13 and lines 28-35).**

**Per Claim 5:**

The Song patent discloses:

- **wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema and the resource file (column 5, lines 1-42).**

Art Unit: 2124

**Per Claim 6:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema, the resource file, and the command list (column 5, lines 1-42).

**Per Claim 7:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema, the resource file, and the annotation (column 5, lines 1-42).

**Per Claim 11:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the command list comprises a transform command (column 1, lines 52-55).

**Per Claim 16:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the action comprises commands (column 1, lines 52-55).

**Per Claim 17:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool is generated using a software development tool generator (column 5, lines 1-42).

**Per Claim 18:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool generator is integrated within an Integrated Development Environment (column 5, lines 1-42).

**Per Claim 19:**

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool is integrated within an Integrated Development Environment (column 5, lines 1-42).

**Per Claim 20:**

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claim 21:**

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claims 22 and 24:**

These are computer-readable medium versions of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1 and 4, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claim 23:**

This is a computer-readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claim 25:**

This is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.



Art Unit: 2124

**Per Claim 26:**

This is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claim 27:**

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

**Per Claim 28:**

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song (U.S. 5,949,999) in view of Lipkin (U.S. 6,721,747).

**Per Claim 8:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 49, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

**Per Claim 9:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 49, lines 50-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility in customization.

**Per Claim 10:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document (column 50, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

**Per Claim 12:**

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor. Lipkin teaches wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor (column 51, lines 52-58 and column 52, lines 25-33).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

**Per Claim 13:**

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 52, lines 7-19).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

**Per Claim 14:**

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata. Lipkin teaches wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata (column 2, lines 34-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to search for and discover information in a more flexible manner.

Art Unit: 2124

**Per Claim 15:**

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and Lipkin further teaches wherein metadata comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 51, lines 52-58).

***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7699 *if calling before October 28, 2004*; otherwise *if calling on or after October 28, 2004*, then the telephone number is (571)272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/036,738

Page 13

Art Unit: 2124

*Kakali Chaki*

QN

September 28, 2004

**KAKALI CHAKI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**